

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-6394**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DWAYNE RODERICK ROSS,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Cameron McGowan Currie, Senior District Judge. (3:09-cr-00714-CMC-1)

---

Submitted: June 26, 2014

Decided: June 30, 2014

---

Before WILKINSON, KING, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Dwayne Roderick Ross, Appellant Pro Se. James Hunter May, John C. Potterfield, Stanley D. Ragsdale, Assistant United States Attorneys, James Chris Leventis, Jr., OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Dwayne Roderick Ross seeks to appeal from the district court's order construing his Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b) motion as a 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion, and dismissing it as successive. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2012). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2012). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the motion states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Ross has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED